

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 21 is added. Claims 7-11 and 15-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. Support for new claim 21 can be found, for example, at page 11, lines 10-12. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**Request for Personal Interview**

Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Patterson contact Applicants' undersigned representative at his earliest convenience to schedule a personal interview to discuss the outstanding rejections, prior to issuance of any further Office Action.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 6246777 to Suzuki et al. ("Suzuki"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Suzuki does not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Claim 1 recites "[a]n insertion-molded cylindrical article, comprising ... a mark of an injection gate opening positioned on said inner surface ... wherein said mark is positioned at said inner surface of the cylindrical molded body while being inwardly apart from said upper end of said insert in an axial direction and at a position corresponding to a position on said inner surface that is covered by said insert." (emphasis added). Suzuki does not teach such an article.

Referring to Suzuki, the Advisory Action asserts that "the portion for accommodating a screw cap (portion '102d' in Figure 2) is clearly a cylindrical portion of the container, and is therefore a cylindrical molded body. The mark of the injection gate is therefore on the inside of the cylindrical body." See Advisory Action, p. 3. The Advisory Action further asserts that "the gate mark is located at a position that corresponds to a position on the inner surface that is covered by the insert, because it is from this position that resin is sent through the mold to

create the entire surface that is covered by the insert. Correspondence therefore exists between this position and a position on the inner surface that is covered by the insert." Id.

Notwithstanding these assertions, Applicants submit that claim 1 distinguishes over Suzuki.

The gate mark of the molded article of claim 1 is inwardly apart from said upper end of said insert and on said inner surface that is covered by said insert. It is indisputable, viewing FIG. 5 of Suzuki, that the injection gates 32 in the mold of Suzuki are positioned at the top of the mold -- above the highest edge of the blank board 103 and at a location corresponding to the narrow, threaded throat of the container. Accordingly, the gate marks of the finished, molded article of Suzuki will be on the inside of the narrow, threaded throat of container. See FIG. 2. The blank board 103 does not cover the narrow, threaded throat of the molded article of Suzuki. The blank board 103 is plainly situated on the wide, cylindrical body of the container, below the narrow, threaded throat.

Returning to the language from claim 1 emphasized above, the gate marks of the molded article of Suzuki are not inwardly apart from said upper end of said insert. Rather, they are outwardly apart from the upper end of the insert. Further, the gate marks of the molded article of Suzuki are not on said inner surface that is covered by said insert. Instead, the gate marks are on a portion of the inner surface that is not covered by the insert. These two claim elements are simply not present in the disclosure of Suzuki. Accordingly, Suzuki does not disclose each and every element of claim 1.

As for the "patentable weight" that should be given the gate marks, Applicants submit that claim 1 recites insertion-molded cylindrical article comprising a structure (i.e., a gate mark situated in a particular position). If Suzuki is to anticipate claim 1, it must disclose the structure recited in claim 1. Absent such disclosure, Suzuki is not an anticipating reference. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that Suzuki does not include such disclosure.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Suzuki. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and thus also is not anticipated by Suzuki. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Suzuki in view of JP 3286815 to Asahi Chemical ("Asahi"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Suzuki does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 3. Asahi does not cure the deficiencies of Suzuki. Claim 3 recites "[a] method for making an insertion-molded cylindrical article ... comprising ... injecting a molten resin through said injection gate opening ... at a position inwardly apart from said upper end of the insert in an axial direction and at a position corresponding to a position on said molded body inner surface that is covered by said insert ..." (emphasis added). Suzuki in view of Asahi would not have rendered obvious such a method.

As discussed above, the injection gates 32 in the mold of Suzuki are not at a position inwardly apart from said upper end of said insert -- they are at a position outwardly apart. Also, the injection gates 32 in the mold of Suzuki are not at a position on said inner surface that is covered by said insert -- they are at a position that is not covered by the insert. This configuration of the Suzuki mold creates problems that are plainly identified in the instant specification. See instant specification, page 2, line 24-page 3, line 16. Namely, when molten resin is injected at a position above an insert, the resin is likely to enter the area between the insert and the mold. By injecting resin from a position covered by the insert, this problem is avoided.

It is undisputed that Asahi does not teach or suggest method for making an insertion-molded cylindrical article comprising injecting a molten resin through an injection gate

opening at a position inwardly apart from the upper end of an insert in an axial direction and at a position corresponding to a position on said molded body inner surface that is covered by the insert. As neither Suzuki nor Asahi teach or suggest a method including this feature, the combination of references would not have rendered claim 3 obvious.

Claim 3 would not have been rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Asahi. Claims 4-6 and 12-14 depend from claim 1, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Asahi. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jacob A. Doughty  
Registration No. 46,671

JAO:JAD/hs

Date: January 16, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--